

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6365

GILBERT STOKES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

STUART SIMMS, Secretary of Public Safety and Correctional Services, sued in his official capacity and individual capacity; WILLIAM W. SONDERVAN, Commissioner of Corrections, Division of Corrections, sued in his individual and official capacity; ALEXANDER FRANCIS, Warden, Maryland Correctional Pre-Release System, sued in his individual and official capacity; SANDRA BOOSE, Facility Administrator, Jessup Pre-Release Unit, sued in her individual and official capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER ANDERSON, sued in his official and individual capacity; CORRECTIONS OFFICER WALKER, sued in her official and individual capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SMITH, V (CPT, sued in her official and individual capacity),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (CA-99-2040-AMD)

Submitted: July 13, 2000

Decided: July 24, 2000

Before WIDENER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gilbert Stokes, Appellant Pro Se. Glenn William Bell, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Gilbert Stokes appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Stokes v. Simms, No. CA-99-2040-AMD (D. Md. Feb. 22, 2000).^{*} We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on February 18, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on February 22, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).